

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted responsive to the Office Action dated April 1, 2008 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed before the expiration of the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-10, 12-13, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,818,920 to Rignell, *et al.* (hereinafter Rignell) in view of U.S. Patent 6,574,486 to Labban (hereinafter Labban), GB 2284965 to Seppo (hereinafter Seppo) and U.S. Patent 6,934,543 to Wang, *et al.* (hereinafter Wang). Claims 16, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rignell in view of Seppo, in further view of Wang. Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rignell, in view of Seppo and Wang, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,075,992 to Moon, *et al.* (hereinafter Moon).

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, Applicants have amended the claims so as to expedite prosecution of the present application. However, such amendments should not be interpreted as the surrender of any subject matter, and Applicants expressly reserve the right to present the original version of any of the amended claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present application.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 9 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. As discussed herein, the claim amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments. Claims 2-7 and 10-22 have been cancelled.

Aspects of Applicants' Invention

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by amended Claim 1, is a method for providing an originating party of a call or message with information local to a receiving party of the call or message.

The method can include identifying an attempt to originate a call or a message from the originating party to a receiving device of the receiving party; prompting the originating party to decide whether or not to receive information local to the receiving party; upon the originating party deciding to receive the information local to the receiving party, sending a request for the local information to a service provider of the receiving party from a service provider of the originating party; and retrieving the information local to the receiving party by the service provider of the receiving party. The local information can comprise a current time, date, and location of the receiving device and information indicating whether the receiving party is not to be disturbed.

The method also can include querying the originating party as to whether to display the current location information of the receiving party; and supplying the retrieved local information to the originating party. Whether or not the current location information of the receiving party is displayed depends on an answer of the originating party to the query.

The method can further include prompting the sending party to select an appropriate action among available actions upon receiving the local information of the receiving party, wherein the available actions include connecting the call or message to the receiving party, sending the call or message to a voicemail or mail box of the receiving party, and disconnecting the call or message; and if the originating party indicates that the call or message is urgent, determining whether to send an alert signal to the receiving device based on the determined local information and the received indication.

See, e.g., Specification, page 8, line 20 to page 11, line 18; see also Figs. 1-2.

The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

Ringell discloses a method and system for preventing calls in a telecommunications network from being connected during specified periods of time, such as when calls to the desired communication terminal have been forwarded to a new communication terminal in a new time zone and the subscriber at the calling communication terminal is unaware of the local time of the new communication terminal. In Ringell, a prevention device is provided. Ringell's device informs the calling communication terminal of the local time of the new communication terminal prior to connection and requests the calling communication terminal to confirm whether the communication connection should be made, or automatically prevents the connection from being made and informs the calling communication terminal that the connection will not be made. See the Abstract.

It is noted that in Ringell the local information only includes the local time, whereas in the present invention the local information includes a current time, date, and location of the receiving device and information indicating whether the receiving party is not to be disturbed.

It is also noted that Ringell does not disclose prompting the originating party to decide whether or not to receive information local to the receiving party, as recited in independent Claims 1, 8, and 9 of the instant application. In contrast, in Ringell the prevention device informs the calling communication terminal of the local time of the new communication terminal prior to connection without prompting for the decision of the calling party.

It is further noted that Ringell does not disclose querying the originating party as to whether to display the current location information of the receiving party, wherein whether or not the current location information of the receiving party is displayed depends on an answer of the originating party to the query, as recited in independent

Claims 1, 8, and 9 of the instant application. In the present invention, the caller can decide if the location of the called party should be displayed. For example, for a display of local information such as "It is now Thursday Apr. 27, 6:00 pm GMT or 4:00 am on Friday Apr. 27 in Sydney Australia," if the caller does not wish the location to be disclosed, then an alternate message can be "It is now Thursday Apr. 26, 6:00 pm GMT or 4:00 am on Friday Apr. 13 at the called party's location" (see Specification, page 9, lines 19-21).

It was asserted in the Office Action that Seppo discloses querying the originating party as to whether to display the current location information of the receiving party (see par. bridging pgs 6-7).

However, it is noted that the paragraph bridging pages 6-7 of Seppo only discloses the display of the time of day of the destination area, not the location information of destination area.

The other cited references do not make up for the deficiencies of Ringell and Seppo as discussed above.

Accordingly, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claims 1, 8, and 9, as amended. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claims 1, 8, and 9 define over the prior art.

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the

U.S. Patent Appln. No. 09/919,391
Amendment Dated July 1, 2008
Reply to Office Action of April 1, 2008
Docket No. BOC9-2000-0084 (219)

Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Date: **July 1, 2008**

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard A. Hinson/

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577

Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652

Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Customer No. 40987

Post Office Box 3188

West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

Telephone: (561) 653-5000